

With Chancellor Fleming's Compliments.

PRINCIPAL GRANT'S
INAUGURAL ADDRESS,

DELIVERED AT

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY, KINGSTON,

ON

UNIVERSITY DAY.

TORONTO

PRINTED BY THE GRIP PRINTING AND PUBLISHING COMPANY.

1885.

Phorburn Collection
Apr. 1914

T

PRINCIPAL GRANT'S
INAUGURAL ADDRESS,

DELIVERED AT

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY, KINGSTON,

ON

UNIVERSITY DAY.

TORONTO:

PRINTED BY THE GRIP PRINTING AND PUBLISHING COMPANY.

1885.

X

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY, Nov. 1st, 1885.

I feel it my duty to transmit to you the Principal's Address delivered at Convocation on "University Day," this Session.

I wish to invite your attention to the Address and to point out to those who have the best interests of the University at heart, the conclusions at which the Principal has arrived with respect to the future of Queen's.

May I ask you to take immediate steps to enrol yourself and others as members or associate members of the Endowment Association. The year 1886 will be the first year of membership, and we earnestly desire to enter the year with a good list of members. Ladies are to be enrolled as associate members, and the subscription for gentlemen or ladies may be one dollar or upwards, per annum. The amount is entirely optional. It is felt that a large number of members at a low rate of subscription will much more effectively promote the objects of the Association, than a small number at a high rate. Pray do not delay returning the accompanying form filled up for membership for the year 1886.

SANDFORD FLEMING,

President Queen's University Endowment Association.

PRINCIPAL GRANT'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

t, 1885.

Address

nt out to
t, the con-
he future

and others

ion. The

earnestly

s are to be

ttlemen or

amount is

s at a low

objects of

ay do not

ership for

ociation.

The subject of University education has been pretty well discussed and conferred about for the past two or three years, and now that there is a lull, it may be well to ask ourselves what was the object of the discussions and the conferences. It is necessary to have clear conceptions on this point, in order that we may ascertain whether any progress has been made, and what our duty is at the present time. It is all the more necessary, because the subject was complicated with so many side issues, personal and local, sectarian and political, that it is little wonder that the general public got a somewhat hazy idea of what was actually involved, and consequently became rather wearied with what seemed a never-ending, still-beginning war of words. The subject was looked at persistently from the standpoint of "Denominational Grants" by writers who forget nothing and never forgive. Local and sectarian prejudices animated gentlemen who protested most loudly their special freedom from every kind of bias. Some, whose idea of a great concert is "all the fiddles of the country in one big hall," were willing to sacrifice the money and rights of other people and other places to any extent in order to have a "great" University. To many the question at issue was between what they called State and Sectarian Universities respectively. To them every University had to be labelled "provincial" or "denominational." They were placidly ignorant of the fact that such terms, far from giving any real information, are simply misleading; that Oxford and Edinburgh are denominational, yet national; and that a living University has always the warrant for its existence in itself, and is to be judged by what it is and what it is actually doing. Two or three illustrations may be given to show the haze through which people saw the subject. One paper published in Toronto, by way of deprecating heated discussion, remarked that it was of little consequence whether University College did or did not get a few hundred dollars a year more than its present revenue. A wise remark, but the writer hardly hit the point at issue. At a meeting of the Senate or Convocation of Toronto University, held last spring, a distinguished professor explained the draft of the confederation scheme that has been given to the public. Being asked how much money it would cost to carry out the scheme, he answered, "Forty or fifty thousand dollars," and his questioner then asked with

the utmost simplicity if the Professor meant that as a capital sum, or the same amount annually! Greater authorities than those to whom I have referred seem to me—with submission, be it said—to have had equally hazy notions on the subject. The *Globe* declared it to be “a matter of first consequence, if only under such a scheme it is possible to secure a University education second to no other at any seat of learning on the Continent.” Some of us might think this aim too modest and also too ambitious. It is possible to believe that Canadians can even now get at one of their own principal Universities an education second to no other at any seat of learning on the Continent; and at the same time to believe that even if the four Ontario Universities were rolled into one, the joint product could not compete with Harvard or Yale in historic associations, with Cornell or Columbia in real or anticipated wealth, with Johns Hopkins in post-graduate work, or with a dozen others as regards numbers of Professors or in special departments of study. We might also think that any scheme that proposed to improve the condition of higher education in Ontario, would be worthy of the most careful consideration, even though it gave no promise that the Ontario University would thereby be second to none on the Continent.

According to the *Week*, the vital point, “the real question,” is whether “Ontario can hope to maintain more than one University sufficiently large and sufficiently well equipped to give a first-rate education, literary and scientific, according to the standard of the present day.” And apparently, as a standard, Cornell is pointed to with a problematical endowment of ten millions. There is no man with whom I would rather see eye to eye on educational matters than with the chief contributor to the *Week*, because of his brilliant record, and because his aims are high and unselfish, but his statement as to the real question at issue in the University discussion, shows that he looks at the subject from a high *a priori* point of view, from which it is utterly impossible that he should either get or give light. President Elliot of Harvard, says that there is not a University worthy of the name in the United States. Yet, if he proposed to get such an institution by breaking up Harvard into two, and sending out a boneless invitation to all the other Universities in New England, or even in Massachusetts, to move to Cambridge, he would be looked upon as an eager aspirant for Bedlam. He knows that there is a more excellent way. The way is for Harvard to go on growing as it has grown for the last half century. Well, if there is no University yet in the United States, a wave of the magic wand of our Minister of Education will hardly call one into existence in Ontario. But, we may secure something that will suit our development and our environment better than a University in the clouds. On the one hand, there is no need that all the “scientific” education of a country should be at one centre. So far as I know, there is no country, great or small, in the universe,

al sum, or
to whom I
have had
t to be "a
is possible
y seat of
s aim too
Canadians
rsities an
Continent;
o Univer-
pete with
lumbia in
ate work,
in special
heme that
n Ontario,
though it
be second

question," is
University
a first-rate
rd of the
ointed to
is no man
atters than
nt record,
nent as to
rs that he
a which it
President
hy of the
h an insti-
a boneless
r even in
pon as an
e excellent
grown for
the United
ation will
cure some-
better than
hed that all
entre. So
e universe,

where it is so concentrated. Massachusetts students of science are not limited to Harvard. The majority of them prefer the Institute of Technology in Boston, not to speak of the other Universities in Massachusetts. In New York State one student of science goes to Columbia, another to Hoboken, another to Rochester, another to Cornell, another to Troy, while a good many go to neighbouring Lehigh or other places. The distributive principle is best. Hoboken is enabled to offer special facilities in technical science; Lehigh, situated in the very centre of a mining region, offers peculiar advantages to a student of mineralogy. The same rule of distribution even in the matter of scientific apparatus holds good in every part of the Old World. Sir William Thomson does not think it necessary to have all kinds of apparatus at his hands even in the one department of science in which he is the acknowledged primate. Although in a great University in the second wealthiest city in the Empire, he thinks it no hardship to run down from Glasgow to conduct experiments in electricity in the Cavendish Laboratory at Cambridge, and very likely he has gone to Paris for the same purpose. Why should we think it necessary to bring to one city all the scientific apparatus that may be required in connection with the daily widening sphere of the knowable, and to mass in the same place all students and all possible means of instruction? On the other hand, the *Week* has consistently adhered to the position that for "literary" education several Arts Colleges are indispensable. But the so-called "confederation" scheme has not a single clause to secure the continued existence of the colleges we now have, much less a single word indicating a desire to improve them. It proposes to bring the existing colleges together, but the proposal is a ghost. It has not a particle of bone, flesh, nerve, or skin. It is simply a bare invitation to the colleges to throw aside their charters, associations, dignity, local strength; to uproot themselves at their own expense, and move to Toronto, just as if it were as easy for a University to move one or two hundred miles as for a crab that travels with its home on its back. If, then, the colleges can accede to the scheme only at the sacrifice of the greater part of their funds at the outset, and in all probability of their continued existence as arts colleges, how are you to get your "first-rate literary education"? Practical teachers, like Mr. Robertson, of St. Catharines, may well ask, "How will the scheme give us strong colleges, a high standard, and above all, strong and efficient teaching and judicious examinations?" and, if graduates of Toronto, will probably answer with him, that far from giving us several good colleges they "see no security in the scheme of confederation, for the main elements of one good college and university, but do see that the evils which now weaken and lessen the power for good of University College and Toronto University, viz., somewhat ineffective teaching and bad examining may be extended, if all rivalry in the form of competing Universities should be abolished." Evidently the only fit parallel to the scheme is the killing the goose

that laid the golden eggs. Briefly then, even if Ontario could begin with a clean sheet and combine all its resources on one University, it could not produce an Oxford, Paris or Berlin. But it cannot begin with a clean sheet, and it is all the better that it cannot. Wise men lived before Agamemnon; and wise men do not disparage the good work done by their fathers or throw away the accumulated sacrifices of fifty years. Besides, Ontario can do better than imitate the frog that would fê be a buffalo. It can recognize frankly and thankfully any good University within its borders. It may also offer to aid in the fuller development of those that have attained to the requisite standard of efficiency, and it can do so without sacrifice of any rational principle, and according to a policy equitable to different sections of the Province, and likely to stimulate local and voluntary effort. All can rejoice in the prosperity of any good institution, and, abstaining from sneers that could easily be paid back in kind, if it were worth while, can unite in seeking the common good.

On this whole subject of University centralization and of the duty of the State, the recent inaugural address of the President of the British Association may well be studied by us. Sir Lyon Playfair is a man of affairs as well as a man of science; and he spoke, knowing that he might soon be called upon to do all in his power to make his words good. He condemns the unwise parsimony of the British Parliament to Universities, in so far, more especially, as science is concerned. He cites the case of little Holland which, with something like the population of Scotland, gives to its four Universities about five times as much annually as the Imperial Parliament gives to the four Scottish Universities. Holland has double the population of Ontario. It gives to its four Universities nearly \$700,000 a year. How long would a Government stand with us if it proposed to vote one-seventh of such a sum annually? The cases of France and other countries are also most striking, but I refer you for particulars to the address itself. But while the President of the British Association calls on the Hercules of the State to put his shoulder to what is really the State's own wheel, he repudiates centralization and all its works. He calls out, for self-governing Universities rather than for affiliated colleges, that "may be turned into mere mills to grind out material for examinations and competitions." He would not uproot even little St. Andrew's. He would strengthen the four Scottish Universities, and he hopes that the five in England may increase in due proportion to the population, by the colleges that have been recently established in different local centres developing into autonomous Universities. There are, he says emphatically, "too few autonomous Universities in England."

I have been speaking of the object we had, or ought to have had, in view during the recent discussions of the University question in this Province and of the confusion of thought on the subject, and the inadequate or false ideas entertained in different quarters. Coming now

to the utterances of President Nelles, we expect to find lucidity and frankness, and we are not disappointed. No man in Canada has a better right than he to speak on University matters, and the one great inducement to me to consider favourably the confederation scheme, was the fact that in his opinion some such scheme was workable, so far at any rate as Victoria was concerned. With him, the object of the whole movement was "neither federation of colleges, nor removal of Victoria from the town of Cobourg, but a satisfactory system of higher education for the Province of Ontario, and an honourable and effective relation to that system on the part of the Methodist Church." Dr. Nelles had thus two objects before him, one educational and the other ecclesiastical. The relation that Victoria bears to the Methodist Church made it necessary that he should regard both objects, and from his point of view the two are inextricably united. We, however, can distinguish between the two, and feel that the first must be the object of every citizen, while the Methodist Church can be safely trusted to look after the second. It would be an impertinence in us to express an opinion as to what the policy of the Methodist Church should be, and its own answer to the confederation scheme has not been given.

The representatives of Queen's occupied a position of peculiar independence during the whole discussion. They were presenting no begging box to the State; and in the Presbyterian Church there is no one policy in University matters which they had to keep in view. The fullest freedom on the subject is laid down in the Church's basis of union. The representatives of Queen's were therefore in a position to keep before their minds one object from first to last. The only question they had to ask was, by what scheme can the most satisfactory system of higher education be obtained, or in what way can improvements be effected? The relation of Queen's to State and Church enabled them to take this position. Like all historic Universities, Queen's is self-governing. The trustees report annually to the General Assembly, and the Assembly as the supreme Court of the Church, every member of which is a corporator of the University, can instruct them as to the policy they should pursue. But the General Assembly can be depended upon to be faithful to the spirit of the Union, and to the history and traditions of the institutions connected with the Church. The Assembly has the power to remove Knox College or Montreal College to Kingston. In my opinion it would be unwise to do so, and certainly the Assembly will never do so in defiance of the feelings and votes of the graduates and benefactors of either of those institutions. Much less would it dream of uprooting the only University connected with the Church, so long as it is fulfilling the great objects for which it was established and receives the hearty aid of friends old and new, and the unanimous support of the section of the country whose educational wants it specially serves, and of a thousand graduates and alumni as loyal as any University in the world can boast.

Owing thus to the position we occupied, the representatives of Queen's at the Conferences were able to give undivided attention to the one question of how best to improve the higher education of the country. In anticipation of the action taken by the Minister of Education, the University Council, at its annual meeting in April, 1884, carefully considered the whole question, and came to the following conclusions:—(1) That a University system similar to that of Scotland and New England was the one best adapted to our history and present condition, and most likely to secure the fullest development of the mind of the people and the resources of the country; (2) That it was the duty of the government either to leave the Universities to depend upon the voluntary liberality which they are certain to receive in due time, or to aid the arts and science faculties in any University that was equipped and endowed up to a designated standard, according to the plan recognized by the British Government in its dealings with the Scottish and Irish Universities, and by the Government of Ontario in its regulations regarding High Schools and Collegiate Institutes. The creation of bogus and the undue multiplication of weak institutions would be prevented by a high standard of equipment and endowment, and wherever public money was given there would be commensurate public control. In other words, the University Council said:—"On this subject, as on most others, the truth is between two extremes. A country may have too many Universities; it may also have too few. Some people think that one is enough for Ontario. We think that there should be at least two; and we would rather have four or five than only one." To this position we have adhered from the beginning. We hold it to-day more firmly than ever.

I must now refer briefly to the conferences held last year; and I shall confine myself to what was said by the representatives of Queen's who were present. I have obtained their permission to refer to the position taken by them, because they and I have observed with astonishment that one or two writers have fathered the confederation scheme on us, in whole or part, or assumed that we are responsible for it, because we were present at, or shortly after, its incubation. I need hardly say that the assumption is preposterous. At the first conference I read a paper which I had previously sent to the Minister of Education, containing a plea for the conclusions of our University Council. But many of the gentlemen who had been invited to the conference had their minds made up in favour of bringing all the arts colleges to a common centre in connection with one University, federating at the same time the theological colleges already in Toronto with the same University, and allowing five theological subjects a place in the University curriculum. Seeing this, Dr. James Maclellan, Q.C., pointed out that while such a scheme might suit institutions in Toronto, or that desired to migrate there, it would not apply to any established in other suitable centres, and that if it was to be advocated on grounds

of public policy, ample Government provision must be expressly made for such cases, and also that it would be useless to submit any scheme to the authorities of Queen's that was not fair all round. The force of these remarks was universally admitted, as the minute that was afterwards formulated of the first conference will show, should it be called for and published. At the opening of a subsequent conference the substance of the scheme was submitted that was given to the public in January last. It outlined a plan that few University men could regard with enthusiasm, and even those most in favour of it acknowledged it to be a compromise based upon no intelligible principle. It was neither consolidation nor confederation, nor did it attempt to grapple with the problem of how to get a system adequate to the necessities of the whole Province. It seemed to us simply a scheme to enable Victoria and Toronto to unite. As a distinguished member of the Senate of Toronto University said subsequently, "Queen's was out of the question from the outset." Therefore, the Chancellor and I took little part in the discussion, and at the close I read a paper that we had drawn up, setting forth that we had attended the conferences without prejudice, and that while we would submit the draft to the authorities of Queen's as that of the only scheme that a majority of those present thought feasible, we declined all responsibility for it, and even declined to sanction its being given to the public till time was afforded us to explain our position in the affair to our constituents. How generally and impartially it was submitted to the constituency of Queen's, the Chancellor explained at last Convocation. How absolutely unanimous was the feeling evoked with reference to it you all know. From professors, students, and graduates, from city, county, and Province, from our friends in the other Provinces, in Great Britain and the United States, the response was the same. We have taken our stand. No matter what may be the action of the other Universities, and neither Trinity nor Victoria has yet given a final answer—there shall not be absolute centralization in higher education in this country. Queen's will remain an autonomous University. Against this decision, there has not been a whisper of dissent, and I may add that among those who have congratulated us most warmly on it are independent and thoughtful graduates of Toronto.

It is hardly necessary to say that this community of sentiment on our part was the result not of one cause or motive. Different men came to the same conclusion for different reasons. Some were influenced by that natural conservatism and caution which is part of the furniture of the most radical Scottish mind, which teaches that a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush, and that it is highly unwise to throw away your old shoes till you know where you are to get new ones. Others were animated by a pride in their *alma mater*, a desire to see her go on growing with the growth of the country as an independent University, a conviction that she has

a great work to do for Canada, a reluctance to let her subside into the humble position of a federated college in a novel and apparently one-sided confederation, and a modest confidence in their own power and will to aid in her future development. Some looked no farther than the benefits conferred on Kingston by the University, and in the spirit of ordinary hucksters counted up the number of dollars that the professors and students spent annually in the place. Others, of a far different spirit, looked at the scheme from a church point of view, and, longing for a strong theological college like Union, saw in it an opportunity of realizing their ideal, but like true patriots the general good weighed down in their estimation the special good that it promised their Church. Not a few, also occupying the Presbyterian standpoint, opposed the scheme because they believed that the life of the Church would be fuller and richer by the preservation in their entirety of its distinctive theological schools. These men appreciate Queen's because of the spirit of its students. They do not estimate a school of thought by the number of its professors or the number of its students, or its money power. For Divinity students, they would rather have one man like Dr. Cook than a dozen ordinary teachers, and they believe that if a professor does his duty to twenty, thirty, or forty students, he is not eating the bread of idleness. Some of our best University men were at the outset in favour of a greater concentration of our scanty educational resources, and with these, in my moments of despondency, I sympathized; but they demanded as prime conditions of their assent to any change full compensation for the losses that would be incurred in removal, and also that no invidious distinctions should be made between the component parts of the new University. When there was any hesitation in granting these conditions they suspected the honesty of those who talked confederation, and when they found that the scheme lacked both, they rejected it with more vehemence than anybody else. To these men the provision by which the arts curriculum was to be partly theological for as many candidates as chose, condemned the whole scheme. Such a provision was contrary to all their ideas of what the B. A. degree should represent. Others were from the outset opposed on principle to both the teaching and examining concentration sought for. They pointed out that wherever and whenever the intellectual life of a country is vigorous it has manifested itself in the establishment of colleges and Universities of different types at every important centre; that we have no example in history of the best results flowing from a monopolizing of all higher educational work by one institution; and that here in particular the results would simply be a great consumption of red tape and hopeless stagnation in University matters. Whatever the views of this or that section of our friends, they all came to the same conclusion, and last June the Chancellor informed the Minister of Education accordingly.

Mr. Micawber would think that the matter was now settled. But, Mr. Micawber was not a graduate of Queen's. To our view a heavier responsibility rests on us than ever before. The object of the movement, in which all of us have taken part, was a desire to improve higher education. We desired this for its own sake and in the interest of all education, for it is a sound maxim that if you would improve the education of a country you must begin at the top. This being the case, our duty is plain. We must go on building on the broad foundations laid by our fathers till we make Queen's in reality all that it is in our dreams. Should the Government in the general interest establish a school of science here, we would be enabled to develop more fully other sides of the University, but we would not thereby have the voluntary burden lightened which we have assumed. We were tempted to throw the burden off. In what we believe to be the best interests of the country, we have resisted the temptation. But if we now go to sleep, it would have been better had we yielded. Universities all over the world are doing their utmost to make their grasp commensurate with the widening field of knowledge. They are calling loudly upon Governments, and with far more hope upon those who believe that wealth is a trust, to do their duty. The call in our day is something like that which was made to Europe at the revival of learning between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries. Nobly did princes and bishops, lords and ladies, individual burghers and cities, country gentlemen and humble priests, then respond to the call. Their foundations have been fountains of generous influence to all the generations that have come after them. Their names have been inspirations to the scholars who from age to age have lit the torch of learning at their shrines, for their own enlightenment and the light of the world. And now these ancient Universities, enriched with benefactions and unearned increment for three, four, five, six centuries or more, do not hesitate to tell the public that they are not rich enough to do the work of the nineteenth century. Is it any wonder that I should have to state from time to time what are our immediate needs, and is not this a fit time? Instead of wondering that I should do so, you ought to be astonished at my moderation.

We should have, within the next few years, five additional professorships in arts and science, formed chiefly by dividing, in almost every section of the curriculum, work that is too extensive for one man. Professor Ferguson will give his whole time to history, whenever we can get a chair of English language and literature. If that cannot be done at once, we should, as a temporary arrangement, engage an assistant. A chair of modern languages is also one of our first necessities. In the present condition of natural sciences, to ask the same man to teach botany, geology, and zoology is almost an absurdity. The chairs of ancient classics and mental and moral philosophy should be divided. We require an additional building for the science depart-

ment, some good travelling fellowships, and an assistant or tutors in connection with almost every chair on account of the increasing number of our students. We should have at least a thousand dollars a year more for the library and a fund from which appropriations could be made for the museum, the laboratories, and the observatory. Dr. Williamson states that \$4,000 is needed for a new equatorial, with spectroscopic and photographic appliances, and other modern equipment for the observatory, and he himself has done so much to add to the apparatus of the University that this modest demand should be attended to promptly.

For the most clamant of these purposes, and to provide for the seven thousand dollars a year of revenue, for which we have a subscription list good for only two years more, we need an addition to our capital of quarter of a million dollars or its annual equivalent. What prospect have we of getting this amount? It is a large sum, but then it is not to be wasted in peripatetics, but to be applied to doubling our capacity for usefulness. As the three chairs most recently instituted in Queen's, the chair of physics, the chair of chemistry, and the third chair in the faculty of theology, are still dependent on fluctuating annual contributions, it would be unwise to appoint any of the additional professors needed in arts until our capital has been largely increased. Where the money is to come from I know not. Certainly, our trust is not in politicians. As for the principal and professors, they intend to continue devoting their whole time and strength to their proper work. They assume no special responsibility in the matter of finance beyond what they feel as graduates or men interested in University education. I believe, however, that the money will come. My faith may seem to some to savour of presumption, but it is enough to point to the example of George Munro giving \$20,000 a year to Dalhousie University in Halifax, and Senator McMaster giving \$16,000 a year to a Divinity Hall in Toronto, not to speak of what men like Donald A. Smith and the Redpaths have recently done for McGill, to show that Canadians are awakening to their duty, and that they can be as liberal and as wise as the wealthy men of the United States. Everything that I have asked from the friends of Queen's since I responded to their invitation to come from the east nearly eight years ago, has been done, and never were they in better heart than now. They point to the significant fact that in no University in the Dominion are there so many students in proportion to the endowment, and their recent action shows that they are satisfied with our work. With regard to what they should do now as a body, I have no better suggestion to offer than that they should make the Association which was organized at last Convocation a thorough success. The Chancellor is President of the Association, and he can be depended on to do his duty. But he must be supported. He asks every graduate and friend of Queen's not only to join the Association promptly, but to get a list

of members in his neighbourhood. To all of these our calendars and reports will be sent regularly, as well as addresses delivered from time to time, and any documents published in the interests of the University. This Association will show who are our friends. The larger the membership the louder the answer from us that Queen's is not to be eliminated in whole or in part from the higher life of the country.

A word now to the students. Gentlemen,—Remember that no matter what University you attend, the professors can do little for you compared to what you can do for yourselves. Have a clear understanding of what you have come here for. Not, I hope, without an aim. Not, I hope, with paltry aims. Not merely to get credit for passing certain classes or examinations that this or that profession has made pre-requisites to a professional career; not merely to get marks or to get a degree, but to get education. You cannot get that by stealing other men's brains. You must work your own brain. You cannot get it by any system of cram or intellectual legerdemain, or by looking out for a soft place in the calendar. You can get it only by being infused with the holy spirit of education. You can get it only by being honest with yourselves. And you must be honest from the beginning of the session. It has been noted as a singular fact since women have been admitted to the Universities, that their average standing is higher than that taken by men. Why? Because their brains are larger, stronger, better? Not at all. I still hold to the old faith, that man is the head of creation. As a rule he has the bigger brain. The creditable, intellectual stand women have taken is mainly due to their moral earnestness. They are more conscientious than men. They work from the beginning of the session.

Immediately after the above address was delivered the friends and members of the Endowment Association who were present held a meeting, when stirring speeches were made and the following resolutions unanimously passed:—

1. Moved by Rev. K. McLennan, M.A., seconded by John McIntyre, Q. C., and

Resolved, That this meeting cordially approves of the steps already taken in the formation of a University Endowment Association, to further the interests of the University.

2. Moved by R. T. Walkem, Q. C., seconded by D. Smythe, Q. C., mayor of Kingston, and

Resolved, That this meeting further recommends that diligent efforts be made to secure the formation of Branch Associations in the various counties and districts of the country in which alumni and friends of the University are situated.

3. Moved by G. M. Macdonnell, Q. C., seconded by John Carruthers, Esq., and

Resolved, That immediate steps be taken to obtain members in Kingston, for the Association.

s be made to
districts of

Jarruthers,

ington, for